

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 94 04:30:13 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #269
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 18 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 269

Today's Topics:

 CW Argument...
 Existing regulations limit our advancement. (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 03:34:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW Argument...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil (David Drumheller) writes:

> Nevertheless, I could agree to slower code requirements. In fact, I
> could agree to the elimination of the Extra Class license entirely. Just
> give all the Extra Class privileges to the Advanced Class licensees, and
> turn all Extra Class licensees into Advanced Class licensees, or visa
> versa. Justification: Morse code is an antiquated mode. Even the Navy
> and Coast Guard have stopped teaching it to radiomen.

There is a HELL of an idea Move the "advanced class ops" to EXTRA rename
General to Advanced (It really isn't "General" anymore) and combine the
extra/advanced written (Improve it?). Eliminate the 20 WPM and keep the 13
or move it to 10.

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 01:50:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <2tsod8\$h04@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>In article <1994Jun17.143310.24177@mixcom.mixcom.com>,

> kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>|> * A non-amateur could initiate a real-time voice conversation with
>|> a licensed amateur.

>We have this capability now with reverse autopatch.

Yes. With everyone else there to listen. Also, imagine every regular user of a large repeater with over 250 members (we have several such systems in Milwaukee) encouraging immediate family members to use such a feature. The repeater would be inundated with personal calls. It also assumes you continuously have your HT on and are monitoring the traffic constantly so you can hear that ONE call for you. Hardly practical, Michael.

>|> * Amateur paging systems.

>Some controllers already have this capability, in a limited sense.

Very limited.

>|> * Fully private encrypted conversation using digitally encoded voice.
>|> Usefull for talking to your spouse, your banker or boss via the phone
>|> patch.

>This I disagree with. Do we want people to get involved in
>amateur radio because they're interested in radio, or because they're looking
>for a cheap alternative to a cell phone?

That would be ONE feature among every other aspect of the hobby.

If the demand was there, the advancements would, IMO, come quicker. Greater membership means more money into the club to buy or build/maintain more advanced systems. While individually, some amateurs have the ability to design such systems, they usually do NOT have the time or money to implement the design on the scale required. They're also usually trying to divide time between career, family and amateur radio.

>preventing you from designing a new STDM repeater network which uses
>digitally-encoded voice and a system id to allow multiple repeaters to
>exist on the same frequency?

I am not independently wealthy. Are you offering me a job?

>j Who says you can't set up a cell-like
>repeater network?

The same song again.

>I think there is no technical innovation because amateurs today are
>more interested in yacking on the local 2-meter good-buddy box instead
>of being interested in radio.

Ok Mike, what technical innovations do YOU propose that we do not yet have that are legal under current part 97 rules? Besides extending coverage or upping baud rates so we can move the same boring packet traffic at a faster rate? How do you propose to finance them?

Certainly a private fully digital system incorporating the previously described features would solve the CB problem for a closed repeater club. Anyone who behaves illegally or who you just don't care for could have his radio locked out by the system.

I acknowledge that such systems are already available commercially for those who can afford them AND the FCC license required for spectrum access. And hence the "problem": big business, wealthy individuals and the government get all the high-end goodies. Such resources would not be beyond the means of a large repeater club with dues large enough to cover the costs. Perhaps several repeater clubs would have to combine resources to cover the cost. But it would then be THEIR system, and not one on which they'd simply be renting air-time. Imagine the systems we could build if the members of a large repeater club, rather than spending \$500 to \$1000 for that 2nd or 3rd rig that they don't really need anyway, were to all pool their money in a research or experimental effort.

The above is the extreme case for a wide coverage system. At the neighborhood or village level, a group of technically competent amateurs could implement a cost effective scaled-down system. A single, technically competent individual in a good location (height) could implement such a system for personal use.

If I were operating a digital (narrow band with encryption or maybe even spread spectrum) system, hypothetically of course, ;-) in the 900 MHZ or higher bands, how many amateurs would really know that I was doing so? Be honest now. Oops! Guess the FCC will be paying me a visit!

The rules for SS emmissions are actually quite humurous. While you CAN send limited SS emmissions conforming to the limited part 97 sequences, you must ID via a narrow band method. Gee, what could they be afraid of? ;-))

```
--
/`-_          kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
{      }/      |
\      /      N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio | Call 1-800-682-1776
|__*|      N9SQB @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA | for more information.
```

Date: 18 Jun 1994 03:41:32 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!spot!myers@ames.arpa
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 24177@mixcom.mixcom.com, kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> () writes:

>
>Here's another question regarding the advancement of our technical abilities
>and also, enhancement of the services we can provide to others...

>
> Are the current FCC regulations (Part 97) actually LIMITING our
> ability to advance the state of the art, rather than encouraging it?
>

>As commercial RF moves to integrated voice and data on the cellular bands
>(via TDMA and/or CDMA) all sorts of additional services become a realistic
>possibility. This makes possible a single, portable RF/computer-based
>device that combines digitized voice, paging, voice mail, FAX, Email, and
>network access. Digital encryption added to all of the above would also
>be a definite plus.

>
>Under the current regulations, we cannot encrypt. Also, we cannot pass

>traffic, data or voice for others without a licensed radio amateur acting
>as a control operator.

>

>No technical advancements come without first having a demand for the
>services that those advancement can provide.

>

>Imagine how much more incentive we would have to build advanced systems
>if the rules were relaxed such that...

>

> * A non-amateur could initiate a real-time voice conversation with
> a licensed amateur. (Here, the rules would have to be changed
> so that amateurs are responsible for a properly functioning
> station, but not the initial triggering of the message.) It's
> kind of like extending the concept of a reverse auto-patch on a
> repeater. I am assuming a closed, private channel here. NO
> interruption of a repeater-style round-table QSO on the part of
> the non-amateur. The non-ham would have access to a specific
> channel (or group of channels) controlled by a system (computer
> based or otherwise) designed/programmed/operated by the licensed
> amateur. While the non-ham, WOULD have access to the available
> communications, it would be controlled by a system for which
> the licensed radio amateur is responsible.

But, there are already radio services to provide such capability. Amateur
radio is not supposed to be used as an alternative to other radio services.

> * Amateur paging systems. (Yes I, know paging transmitters require
> multiple sites and a hell of a lot of power to reach those tiny
> little receivers that attach to your belt.) And, no, I don't
> consider DTMF decode on an HT (opened via tones passed through
> the repeater) a realistic substitute.

How would building an amateur paging network help advance the state of the
radio art? Anyway, if you want a pager, there are already existing radio
services for this.

> * Fully private encrypted conversation using digitally encoded voice.
> Usefull for talking to your spouse, your banker or boss via the phone
> patch.
> (We are so concerned with the anti-business related traffic laws that
> the only conversations allowed preclude the demand for any non-amateur
> initiated/related communications. I am not suggesting offering the
> services to anyone but immediate family. An emergency situation, of
> course, is different.)

But, there are already other radio services for calling people on the telephone.
What good does letting ham radio be used for this do?

>These are just a few examples. Imagine the potential for enhanced public
>service (and technical advancement) if we had such systems!

You can have such systems. Go to your local two-way radio store, pay your
bucks, and you can have these services. They already exist. GMRS, LMRS,
SMR, paging, etc.

>And so I say to the FCC: Get the hell off my back!! You cannot take away
>my spectrum for lack of technical competence/publc service and give it away
>to commercial RF when the very rules by which I must abide PROHIBIT me from
>designing the systems that would allow us to be a greater (and FREE) public
>service in the first place!

Well, your suggestions above indicate you think the FCC should allow amateurs
to use amateur radio as alternatives to the existing radio services. If this
is the case, why *not* just give the amateur frequencies to the commercial
services?

My point is, amateur radio is not intended just to deploy more radios like
we already have all over the commercial services. Amateur radio is intended
to be experimental, and a test bed for new technologies. Allowing too much
"end user" consumer style use already stifles the technical development
in amateur radio.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 18 Jun 1994 01:20:02 -0400

From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun17.143310.24177@mixcom.mixcom.com>, kevin jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>>

(We are so concerned with the anti-business related traffic laws that
the only conversations allowed preclude the demand for any
non-amateur
initiated/related communications. I am not suggesting offering the

services to anyone but immediate family.

<<

We have good reason to be concerned with business related traffic. There is nothing more powerful than a financial interest... and given the opportunity, financial interests will override all other interests on the ham band. Financial interests are usually short term, and care not a whit about the long term or about other users.

If we are concerned that business interests not grab our spectrum by having the government auction it off, we should also be concerned that we don't surrender the spectrum to our own business interests...by permitting business use too liberally too quickly.

Jose KD1SB

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 1994 22:38:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2thlsf\$t0i@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, <061594011032Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<2tmua7\$4di@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>I had said:

>

>>While a trustee may not "own" the frequency and be able to prevent other
>>individuals from using those frequencies if desired, there is nothing in
>>the rules which state a coordinating body must coordinate more than one
>>repeater on a frequency pair.

>>

>>So, in essence, a coordinated repeater can have exclusive use of a frequency
>>pair in relation to other coordinated repeaters.

>

>

>In article <061594011032Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) replies:

>

>|> Not only is this WRONG AGAIN! It is a direct VIOLATION of Part 97.

>

>You know Dan, I'm beginning to think you keep saying everyone's wrong
>but you in an attempt to convince yourself you're right.

>

>Please quote the relevant section of Part 97 which states that a coordinating
>body must coordinate more than one repeater on a frequency pair.

You said;

"So, in essence, a coordinated repeater can have exclusive use of a frequency pair in relation to other coordinated repeaters."

Part 97.101 (b) says;

"Each station licensee and each control operator must cooperate in selecting transmitting channels and in making the most effective use of the amateur service frequencies. *No frequency shall be assigned for the exclusive use of any station.*" (emphasis added)

Now, although I was in reference to your statement I quoted above which IS, as I said, a direct violation of Part 97 we could go on to infer something about coordination bodies. However "I" will not make that statement. I was commenting on your exclusive frequency comment. Guess that makes you wrong again, huh?

>My statement stands, and is correct. In relation to other coordinated
>repeaters, a repeater can have exclusive use of a frequency because a
>coordinating body may decide not to coordinate more than one machine per
>frequency.

Coordination does NOT equal exclusive use. You are wrong again. Why not just give up instead of PROVING how wrong you can be.

>And, as my quote clearly states, this does not mean that other people
>can't use the frequency for simplex or setting up an uncoordinated
>repeater, or that I "own" the frequency.

No, however, as quoted above you said;

"So, in essence, a coordinated repeater can have exclusive use of a frequency pair in relation to other coordinated repeaters."

This is WRONG as it is directly a violation of part 97! You can NOT give exclusive use to any station. You could say that, given the distance multiplexing used today, that I am the only coordinated repeater in 100 miles or something like that. However you do NOT have "exclusive" use of a frequency in relation to ANY amateur station. Part 97.101 (b) prohibits that.

>MD

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 01:48:53 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!

gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <lfloydCrH6Lq.KCu@netcom.com>,

<1994Jun16.184632.27143@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <mgalatz.1122191183A@198.7.0.1>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Getting started

In article <mgalatz.1122191183A@198.7.0.1> mgalatz@panix.com (Menachem Galatz DC) writes:

>I

>>

>>That's very misleading Larry. The Tech license gives *all* amateur

>>priviledges on 99.99% of the amateur spectrum. Only the small segments

>>of amateur spectrum below 30 MHz are restricted to other classes.

>

>What parts of the under 30mhz amateur spectrum are restricted for a no code

>technician?

All of it, no code test Technicians are restricted from all operations below 30 MHz.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 03:59:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!

dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <EIh\$jexTYtRT063yn@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <061594092829Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,

<9WK0kexTYV8F063yn@nyx10.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: license turnaround times..

dratzlaf@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Norby) writes:

>In article <061594092829Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill wrote:
>> dratzlaf@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Norby) writes:
>>
>> >I took my tests the last weekend in February. I believe the VE's sent in
>> >the forms 1st of March. Myself, I'm still waiting on my ticket...
>> >
>> >It's been around, what, 15 weeks I think...
>
>> Yep. A friend just got his after 12 weeks. It should be there pretty
>> quickly.
>
>
>Yep, it came today!
>
>Daniel Ratzlaff
>
>
>--
> Internet: dratzlaf@nyx.cs.du.edu
> | \ |
> | \ | "Leave the night-light on
> | \ | inside the birdhouse in your soul"--TMBG
> | \ | orby

Congradulations!

WHAT IS THE CALL?

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 03:23:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <ZQyuHr4.edellers@delphi.com>, <2tnbi4\$32a@agate.berkeley.edu>,
<BWyz4YE.edellers@delphi.com>

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Ken A. Nishimura <kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU> writes:

>

>>Part 97.205e:

>>

>> Ancillary functions of a repeater that are available to
>> users on the input channel are not considered remotely
>> controlled functions of the station. LIMITING THE USE
>> OF A REPEATER TO ONLY CERTAIN USER STATIONS IS PERMISSIBLE.

>

>Right. So if the guy who's coordinated doesn't allow me to use his repeater,
>either (A) it must be legal for me to use the frequency WITHOUT using that
>repeater, or (B) I am being excluded from the FREQUENCY, not just the
>repeater. I contend that Part 97 disallows (B).

Where in part 97 does it grant access to all frequencies or bar anyone
from a specific frequency (outside the band plan and coded frequencies?)

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 03:19:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCrH3qz.5www@netcom.com>, <2tpf1c\$hg6@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,
<rogjdCrHxxK.4pG@netcom.com>org

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

>Well, Mike, that's a pretty nifty argument. Basically you're saying:

>"Jay is right, but it can't be proven. But he's still right."

>

>Sorry. Although some of what you say up above is true, your unspoken
>assumption is that coordinating groups are frequently faced with this,
>and the people who threaten such suits have credible financial resources
>in order to give their threat of a suit credibility.

>
>That's quite a leap of faith.
>
>It really doesn't work that way. For a lawyer to take a suit on
>contingency in this fashion:
>
>A) the target must have deep pockets. (Doesn't sound like most
>coordinating groups to me!)
>
>B) the suit must have reasonable credibility. (Here is the test you
>really fail. The courts aren't likely to want to muck about in this
>quagmire. They would rather leave it to us crusaders on the Internet
>:-))
>
>C) even after A/B, the lawyer generally likes a retainer; the fatter the
>better. \$5K-10K is usually the rule. This amount is equal to the value
>of some repeaters.
>
>This is why I don't buy your argument. Sure, if you read the newspapers,
>there are examples of frivolous suits, settlements which don't make
>sense, etc. But in the real world, although such events are more
>plentiful than you and I think they should be, they aren't really all
>that common.

I think, having seen what LOTS of PRACTICING lawyers will do, that it is more common that you admit. And MUCH more common than you claim above. But I still feel it is valid to discuss.

>You know, Mike, it really is possible to debate on the Internet without
>making personal comments about others. You don't know me well, and
>really have little idea what I do or don't know about the law, and a
>review of my posts is a poor way to form such an opinion.
>
>FWIW, I don't claim to know that much (yet :)) Points A/C above I
>obtained from a lawyer this morning :-) :-)

Maybe from an ethical lawyer, note that those are not the only kind and unfortunately may not even be in the majority. (They are a Jewel to find though!)

73,

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #269
